

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/771,692 | PARK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Alison K. Pickard | 3673 | |

All Participants:

(1) Alison K. Pickard.

(2) David Suter.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1, 13, 14, 16, and 17

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner called to clarify some language in claim 1, which needed proper antecedent basis. And, claims 13, 14, 16, and 17 were withdrawn due to a restriction (process claims) and needed to be cancelled. Claims 21, 22, and 24 will be rejoined as those relate to the election requirement and require the limitations of the allowed product claim 18. Applicant agreed to the changes, which are entered via examiner's amendment..